

## REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Office for the careful consideration given to his application in the communication mailed 02/22/2007. In that communication, the Office rejected claims 3 – 5, 7 – 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (4,966,311). Claims 3 – 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (4,966,311) in view of Madison et al. (6,499,937).

In this amendment, the Applicant has amended independent claims 3 and 14 to better distinguish the invention over Taylor and Madison et al. The Office, in its 2/22/2007 communication, stated that “As the applicant has failed to show criticality or unexpected results, an I-beam is considered to be a matter of design choice. That is to say, without a trolley & hoist, an I-beam serves no unique purpose.” Claims 3 and 14 are amended to claim the trolley and hoist and their purposes. This amendment is amply supported in the specification at paragraph [0025] and Figs. 1 – 3. Dependent claims 4, 5 and 6 are amended to claim further details of the apparatus.

For the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. The Office is encouraged to telephone the Applicant’s attorney to resolve any remaining issues to bring about a speedy allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Phillip E. Decker/

Date: July 23, 2007  
Tel. No. 603-766-1910  
Fax No. 603-766-1901

Phillip E. Decker, Reg. No. 39,163  
Attorney for Applicant  
1 New Hampshire Ave., Suite 125  
Portsmouth, NH 03801